

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: <u>07/07/2025</u>

X	:	
BLAKE LIVELY,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	24-cv-10049
	:	
-v-	:	<u>ORDER</u>
	:	
WAYFARER STUDIOS LLC, JUSTIN BALDONI,	:	
JAMEY HEATH, STEVE SAROWITZ, IT ENDS WITH	:	
US MOVIE LLC, MELISSA NATHAN, THE AGENCY	:	
GROUP PR LLC, JENNIFER ABEL, JED WALLACE,	:	
STREET RELATIONS INC.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	
X	:	
WAYFARER STUDIOS LLC, JUSTIN BALDONI,	:	
JAMEY HEATH, IT ENDS WITH US MOVIE LLC,	:	
MELISSA NATHAN, JENNIFER ABEL, STEVE	:	
SAROWITZ,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
-v-	:	
BLAKE LIVELY, RYAN REYNOLDS, LESLIE	:	
SLOANE, VISION PR, INC., THE NEW YORK TIMES	:	
COMPANY,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	
X	:	

LEWIS J. LIMAN, United States District Judge:

Jed Wallace (“Wallace”) and Street Relations, Inc. (“Street Relations” and together, the “Wallace Defendants”), move for a protective order preventing Street Relations from having to disclose any name in its client base beyond those identified as parties in Lively’s complaint.

Dkt. No. 380. For the reasons that follow, the motion is denied.

The Wallace Defendants argue that the identities of its clients are not relevant to any claim in Lively's complaint and that sharing their identities would be an undue burden because the services performed by Street Relations are highly sensitive and confidential. *Id.* at 1–2. Relevancy under Rule 26 is to be “construed broadly to encompass any matter that bears on, or that reasonably could lead to other matter[s] that could bear on, any issue that is or may be in the case.” *Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders*, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978); see *In the Matter of the Complaint of Specialist LLC*, 2016 WL 6884919, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 22, 2016); *Condit v. Dunne*, 225 F.R.D. 100, 105 (S.D.N.Y. 2004). The identities of Street Relations’ clients are relevant because they reasonably could lead to information bearing on the issues in this case. Lively seeks to understand whether Street Relations has engaged in campaigns for other clients similar to the campaign alleged in this case. If Street Relations has participated in digital campaigns for other clients to harm the reputation of third parties, it is more likely to have done so here, as Lively alleges. See 1 McCormick on Evid. § 198 (9th ed. 2025) (“Evidence concerning other contracts or business dealings may be relevant to prove . . . a business habit or custom.”); *LaPlante v. Estano*, 228 F.R.D. 115 (D. Conn. 2005). Street Relations represents that it will “testify about the services it provided for its anonymous clients.” Dkt. No. 380 at 2. But Lively is entitled to test for herself whether the digital footprints of other clients have similarities to the work Street Relations is alleged to have done here, and to do so at a level of granularity that will not be addressed by a 30(b)(6) representative’s general testimony about the type of services provided.¹

¹ Rule 26 provides that “[i]nformation within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Therefore, the Court need not address here whether the names of Street Relations’ clients or evidence of Street Relations’ other business dealings would be admissible at trial.

The fact that Street Relations' client list is sensitive and confidential does not constitute an undue burden that would justify a protective order. “[C]ourts commonly require parties to produce confidential documents; the confidentiality of those documents is protected not by denying access to them, but by entering a protective order to cover them.” *Doe v. Benjamin Zaremski M.D., P.C.*, 2022 WL 2966041, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2022) (quoting *United States v. Newman*, 531 F. Supp. 3d 181, 193 (D.D.C. 2021)); see *ABC Rug & Carpet Cleaning Serv. Inc. v. ABC Rug Cleaners, Inc.*, 2009 WL 105503, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 14, 2009); *Chembio Diagnostic Sys., Inc. v. Saliva Diagnostic Sys., Inc.*, 236 F.R.D. 129, 136 (E.D.N.Y. 2006). The Court has already entered a protective order in this case preventing the disclosure of confidential material. Dkt. No. 125. This is sufficient to account for Street Relations' confidentiality interests here.

The motion for a protective order is DENIED.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close Dkt. No. 380.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 7, 2025
New York, New York



LEWIS J. LIMAN
United States District Judge